

than to take care of the veterans of today. The 110th Congress has made the needs of veterans a priority and I rise in support of several pieces of veterans legislation that passed the House of Representatives on May 20, 2008.

Too many veterans and their families suffer economically as a result of injury or disability that occurred during service. The Veterans Cost of Living Adjustment Act (H.R. 5826) ensures that veterans disability payments and dependency and indemnity compensation for veterans' families keep up with inflation.

Those soldiers that are injured during war deserve affordable and quality medical treatment when they return home. The Veterans Emergency Care Fairness Act (H.R. 3819) allows veterans to be reimbursed for receiving emergency treatment in non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities. Also, the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Authorization and Lease Act (H.R. 5856) authorizes vital improvement and expansions to VA hospitals and clinics around the country.

According to the 2007 National Survey on Drug Use and Health, approximately 1.9 million veterans suffer from diagnosable substance abuse. The Veterans Substance Use Disorders Prevention and Treatment Act (H.R. 5554) funds drug screening, detoxification, relapse prevention and counseling for veterans. It also creates an online pilot program that provides treatment to Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans for substance abuse.

Finally, the Veterans Benefits Awareness Act (H.R. 3681) helps veterans and their families learn about available government services. The VA will now be able to advertise in the national media in order to reach out to more veterans about homeless assistance, healthcare benefits, mental health services, educational and vocational opportunities, and other benefits.

I want to thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman FILNER, and my colleagues for passing these important and vital bills to help veterans and their families.

#### EARMARK DECLARATION

### HON. KENNY C. HULSHOF

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 2008

Mr. HULSHOF. Madam Speaker, I submit the following:

Requesting Member: Congressman KENNY HULSHOF.

Bill Number: H.R. 5658, Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009.

Account: Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E), Aviation Advanced Technology.

Legal Name of Requesting Entity: Westar Aerospace & Defense Group, Inc., 4 Research Park Drive, St. Charles, MO 63304-5685; On behalf of: Aeromechanics Division, AMSRD-AMR-AE-A, Aviation Engineering Directorate, Bldg 4488 Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5000.

Address of Requesting Entity: Westar Aerospace & Defense Group, Inc., 4 Research Park Drive, St. Charles, MO 63304-5685; Aeromechanics Division, AMSRD-AMR-AE-A, Aviation Engineering Directorate, Bldg 4488, Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5000.

Description of Request: To provide \$10 million in funding to continue the development of

integrated Aviation tools and provide this ability to all Army Aviation systems to include UH-60 series, OH-58D, AH-64D), Fixed Wing and UAS systems. The complete integrated aviation solution includes implementing the automated maintenance test flight tool, automated weight and balance software, and integration with current logistics and Aviation Mission Planning systems. These products are urgently needed by combat units in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, and will result in significant increases in mission effectiveness and safety for our warfighters. These tools will be used by our military's aircraft operators to greatly improve their effectiveness and situational awareness, which will improve support to the warfighter from materiel developers.

#### THE CORRECT APPROACH TO GLOBALIZATION

### HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 2008

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, the overriding economic issue confronting our country is the task of proceeding with the increased globalization of the economy in a manner that promotes an equitable distribution of the benefits. For too many years, until fairly recently, there was a consensus supported by many in the academic and business establishments that argued that concern about the distribution of the benefits of globalization was unnecessary at best and disruptive at worst, and that if we simply proceeded with greater openness, in trade, in the freeing of capital from any restraints, and in other ways, we would all be better off.

It is now indisputable that this is not the case, and that growth has proceeded in the U.S.—and in some other parts of the world—in recent years in a manner that has increased both wealth and inequality. Of course it is the case that in a capitalist system, some inequality is necessary for the economy to function. But we have seen inequality grow far beyond what is either productive or, in the minds of many of us, morally justifiable. Many of us have argued to people in the business community that the resentment that is being generated—very legitimately—by this increased inequality has become an obstacle to the adoption of policies that they think are in our national interest. Many of us, including I believe the leadership on economic issues of the Democratic Party here in the House, believe that we should proceed with globalization in a reasonable and orderly way, but accompanied by policies that offset its tendencies to increase inequality, erode environmental standards, and promote reckless deregulation. Recently, former Treasury Secretary Larry Summers wrote interesting articles in the Financial Times strongly arguing that such a position is both necessary and achievable. In the Financial Times of May 21, Martin Wolf, a very thoughtful economic commentator, makes a further important contribution to this debate. The movement from an unqualified cheer for globalization without any concern for its negative consequences on substantial numbers of Americans to a thoughtful discussion of how to go forward with the economic integration of

the world in a socially useful manner is a very welcome one. Martin Wolf's contribution to that debate in the Financial Times is therefore very important and I ask that it be printed here.

[From the Financial Times, May 21, 2008]

#### HOW TO PRESERVE THE OPEN ECONOMY AT A TIME OF STRESS

(By Martin Wolf)

Is the spread of prosperity in the interests of citizens of today's high-income countries? Is globalisation of their economies in their interest?

These distinct questions are raised in my mind by two important columns from Lawrence Summers ("America needs to make a new case for trade" on April 27 and "A strategy to promote healthy globalisation" on May 4). In these, Mr. Summers argues that the international economic policies of the U.S. need to be coupled more closely to the interests of its workers. Many Europeans will concur.

This is not to argue that the interests of citizens of high-income countries are more important than those of others. On the contrary, the view that increases in incomes of the poor offset equivalent losses for the rich is morally compelling. But politics is national. Unless or until a global political community emerges, politics will respond only to perceptions of national interest.

So is the rising prosperity of China, India and other emerging economies in the interests of today's high-income countries? The correct answer to this is: not necessarily. It would be absurd to pretend otherwise.

The big advantages of the spread of prosperity include a wider distribution of innovation and bigger opportunities for profitable exchange. The rise of the U.S. brought such benefits to the U.K. Also valuable (though not certain) is greater political stability in previously impoverished countries.

The big disadvantage is greater competition for scarce resources. Power is a scarce resource: if country A has more, country B has less. Resources are also limited. If commodity prices rise, the terms of trade (the relative prices of exports and imports) of net importers will deteriorate: countries have to sell more exports to obtain given imports.

Since the end of 2001, U.S. terms of trade have deteriorated by an eighth, as commodity prices have soared and the currency devalued. This has turned an 18 per cent increase in real gross domestic product between the last quarter of 2001 and the fourth quarter of 2008 into a 16.4 per cent increase in real national income. The difference is not huge. But it is worth some \$220bn in today's dollars. So countries may indeed be harmed by the prosperity of others. (See charts).

The answer to this is: so what? As Willem Buiter has pointed out (Economic Internationalism 101, Maverecon, May 5), nothing can be done to halt the diffusion of "knowledge, skills, technology, management systems" and so forth. Or at least nothing rational or decent can be done. Of course, the U.S. could launch an unprovoked blockade or even war against China or India. To mention such ideas is to reveal their strategic and moral bankruptcy.

The U.S. could, it is true, try to halt the flow of ideas. The U.K. tried to halt the spread of technology to the U.S. in the early 19th century: it failed. The Chinese empire once made it a capital crime to export silkworms: that failed, too. Similarly, protectionism against the emerging countries might slow their growth, but would not halt it. Yet it would guarantee a breakdown in international relations that threatened hopes of a peaceful future.

To repeat, nothing can be done about the rise of emerging countries, as they follow the